

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-37. Claims 1, 5, 11, 20, 23, 29, 36 and 37 are amended herein. Claim 6 is cancelled herein without prejudice. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1-5 and 7-37 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT FILED NOVEMBER 17, 2003:

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the Preliminary Amendment filed on November 17, 2003 did not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

The amendments presented in the November 17, 2003 Preliminary Amendment are reproduced herein.

It is respectfully submitted that these amendments now comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION:

At item 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected the Specification. Pertinent parts of the Specification are amended herein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO CLAIM 23:

Claim 23 was objected to as being of improper dependent form. Claim 23 is amended herein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101:

Claims 29-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Independent claims 29, 36 and 37 are amended herein to recite, "a computer readable medium", which is directed to a statutory subject matter (claims 28-35 depend on claim 29).

It is respectfully submitted that claims 29, 36 and 37 and dependent claims dependent therefrom satisfy the requirements of §101, and thus withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 1-7, 20-26 and 29-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0070973 (Croley).

The claimed invention eliminates the need to repeatedly enter data by retrieving data input by a user stored in association with identifying information of the user.

Independent claim 1, by way of example, recites displaying “a screen containing a data input box for data specified by data identifying information in accordance with definition information on the screen” and “storing the data inputted to the data input box together with the data identifying information.” Claim 1 also recites, “searching for the data corresponding to the data identifying information when having the screen displayed, and “setting the searched data into the data input box specified by the data identifying information”, where the data is stored in a way that “relates to the information for identifying the user”, and the control unit “searches for the data corresponding to the data identifying information for every user.” Claims 20 and 29 recite similar features.

Croley discusses consolidation of information to produce a form for display on a single screen page. In Croley, each completed data form (110) is stored and certain data fields are designated as key default fields (115) (see, paragraph 29). Then, a new form (118) that retains the original single screen page, size and geometry as that of the original data form is employed for subsequent review of the information (see, paragraphs 30, 31 and 34). Meaning, Croley is limited to configuring a default view of a form with data fields for displaying the form on a single screen and storing the form in that view.

Further, Croley is directed to customizing the display for a specific user, for example, an ophthalmologist (see, paragraph 35 and Fig. 6 and corresponding text).

Croley does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention including “searching for the data corresponding to the data identifying information, and “setting the searched data into the data input box”, as taught by the claimed invention.

It is submitted that the independent claims are patentable over Croley.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Croley. The dependent claims are also independently patentable.

For example, as recited in claim 3, "the storage unit is stored with plural pieces of data inputted to the data input box in the past, and the control unit sets, into the data input box, one piece of data among the plural pieces of data, and has the remaining data displayed as options in the vicinity of the input box." The Croley system does not teach or suggest these features including setting "one piece of data among the plural pieces of data" into the data input box where "the remaining data [is] displayed as options in the vicinity of the input box" as recited in claim 3 (see also claims 9, 15, 22 and 31).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 8-19, 27, 28, 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croley.

Claim 8 recites, "searching for the data corresponding to the data identifying information from the storage unit when transmitting to the terminal the definition information of the screen containing the data input box for the data specified by the data identifying information" and "setting the searched data into the data input box." Independent claims 14, 27, 28, 36 and 37 recite similar features.

As mentioned above, Croley is limited to customized view of data fields of a data form for display on a single a single screen page of computer monitor. Further, Croley only discusses transposing selected data entries into an e-mail format (see, paragraph 39).

Croley does not teach or suggest the above features including "searching for the data corresponding to the data identifying information when transmitting the definition information of the screen containing the data input box" and "setting the searched data into the data input box", as recited in independent claims 8, 14, 27, 28, 36 and 37 recite similar features.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, the dependent claims are also patentably distinguishable over Croley.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 05/01/2007

By: *Temnit Afework*
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 56,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501